

Alan Watt on
"Sweet Liberty" with Jackie Patru
July 6, 2005

WWW.CUTTINGTHROUGHTHEMATRIX.COM

www.alanwattsentientsentinel.eu

Jackie: Good evening ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for joining us tonight on Sweet Liberty. It is Wednesday. It is the 6th of July in the year 2005. It is end of our broadcast week, Monday through Wednesday now. It goes pretty fast. Last night I was reading to you from the third book that Alan Watt has written titled "Cutting Through" and Alan is with us tonight so maybe we can discuss some of what's in the book. I have some questions myself about this situation, the Hapiru or Habiru, and maybe Alan can clear it up and I thought it would be a good idea to do that on the air because sometimes Alan and I have conversations off air and that I am so regretful that I wasn't tape recording because you can never repeat it.

Jackie: Okay. Let me tell you where my confusion is. The Habiru or Hapiru are spelled differently but they seem to have been – well, they talked about 1500 BC where they were written in the ancient accounts and obviously before that. That word back then meant the "dusty ones" because they were the caravaneers or whatever you call them, the merchants, the bankers, the gold and silver and money lenders, et cetera, the controllers. Okay. Would that be the priesthood, Alan?

Alan: I think they were probably were not the actual priesthood, generally speaking. They would run a hierarchy though. There's no doubt there would be some sort of coordination of a hierarchy because they all had exactly the same system regardless of which countries they had run into and which countries they were trading with. They were all using the same weights and measures wherever they went, which goes back to a common source and it was primarily silver they were introducing into those countries in those days. They had sources of silver and they also owned the mines in fact.

Jackie: And those were what they referred to as the Habiru?

Alan: Yes. The spelling is irrelevant. The Greeks wrote it one way and another bunch would write another way. It's the phonetic pronunciation that's important, so whether there's an H there or not doesn't matter.

Jackie: Oh where you put the emphasis on which--

Alan: Yes, because it was a term to describe the same and they were all Aramaic speaking people and they traded all the way from the Middle East into India and back again. In fact, Aramaic was the common trade language from basically the Aramean area right through the Middle East and across to India. That was the language of trade you might say was Aramaic.

Jackie: Maybe you don't know, but it seemed to me that they would have to have

learned to speak the languages of the people with whom they traded.

Alan: They did. Sometimes the banker ones, the higher orders of them, would settle in a city for a period of time.

Jackie: To take over that city?

Alan: They'd settle in the city and most of them settled outside the city. They were nomadic people. They were always nomadic by nature and hence they had no city of their own basically, most of the time anyway. They'd settle on the outskirts of the city and seemed to have a disdain for the city people and I have no doubt that the city people had a disdain for them too because their whole business was haggling – haggling over the price of things and the price of goods and so on, which isn't a pleasant thing you know. However, that was their nature was to haggle for a good deal, but wherever they went they tried to introduce the silver monetary system, first by weighing and then eventually when coinage came along they introduced the coins.

Jackie: Because those were weighed out perfectly already.

Alan: It's known too that these – they had different names for them. The Phoenicians basically were almost the seafaring branch of the same people, so the Phoenicians seem to be of the same people. It was almost a brotherhood really.

Jackie: See, it's really confusing to me.

Alan: It isn't so confusing because it's like any brotherhood that's in on a big scam. You have to have secrecy. You have to keep apart from the other people and you'd have to instill it into your followers to keep apart from other people so that they wouldn't loose their mouths off and let the game away that they were into so many different scams.

Jackie: In the Armana letters that you quote here, it says, "*There was also a large and apparently increasing class of stateless and reputedly lawless people in Palestine and Syria to whom the appellation Apiru (or Habiru) was given. It has now become certain that they were a class of heterogenous (mixed races) ethnic origin...*" Well, what were their races?

Alan: That was a later – the term again seemed to be used again for another bunch who came along who joined them and these were a mercenary class which had originated from people who'd been cast out of tribes and cast out of cities. They were kicked out and so they became another branch of the brotherhood and that's where centered themselves and they would lease themselves out for hire as mercenaries.

Jackie: All right. How does that connect up with the people today that we know as Jews? That they call themselves Jews so that's the only thing I know to call them.

Alan: The ones today of course, they primarily come from the Khazarian lineage which was centered around the Black sea area and converted en masse to Judaism

around the 5th or 6th century AD.

Jackie: 740 AD I think I read. I would have been around there.

Alan: Most of them don't have any lineage too, what was traditionally - in fact in Judaism didn't appear until the fall of Babylon and that's when a group of people came out of there with the Pharisees leading them and that's when the first time in history that the term Jew or Judaic people was mentioned.

Jackie: And they call them Jews but actually it would be more appropriate to call them Talmudists. I mean it's a religion that binds them all.

Alan: It was a religion that was born in Babylon. There's no secret there because rabbis will tell you that there are two - one is a continuation of the other. In other words, the Judaic or the Exodus of leaving Babylon, the one that was written or compiled after that is really an extension of the part that was condensed inside Babylon; and when they come to points of doctrine, if there's a conflict, the Babylonian Talmud gets precedence over the other.

Jackie: Well okay. Where was the other - what do you mean the other?

Alan: The other one was a continuation because they were still writing the Talmud when they came out and they continued it for a long time.

Jackie: So it would basically be the Babylonian Talmud?

Alan: Yes.

Jackie: And they would be Talmudists?

Alan: Well, they would be, but the Pharisees themselves were a separate sect. In fact, they were a secret brotherhood, very small in fact, initially, 2,000 years ago, and they were only one small sect among many but they did have an awful lot of money, so they had power because of money. Part of the tradition at that time 2,000 years ago was to treat their fellow Jews they supposedly looked after no better than anyone else, because in a sense the Pharisaic tradition coming out of Babylon was the ancient Illuminati of its day.

Jackie: And they weren't even of the same race as the people that they took over there?

Alan: Are you talking about the ones who went back recently?

Jackie: No. When they came out and they went and they read the new law to the people, there is an account of that in the Old Testament and said the people wept because the people had already begun to intermingle.

Alan: Also, one of them found a holy book and so they didn't even know what their own laws were supposed to have been. I mean it's such nonsense; it's a fairy tale. You do understand this is a fairy tale?

Jackie: Yes.

Alan: It's a foundation myth you see and in foundations myths they always make up a lot of things to try and justify something which never really happened and that's why you have so many contradictions. However, in reality, Judaism came on the scene for the first time with anything at all to do with what we now know as the New Testament. It came on the scene only about 400 BC.

Jackie: And a lot of what was involved in that, of course there were a lot of made up stories.

Alan: They were all borrowed stories.

Jackie: Exactly and they used some actual history to weave it in about and around their sect of people, the people that they lassoed into that "religion?"

Alan: You've got to understand that in all times, more so back then, you had a military peasant class with a priesthood – no different from the Catholic Church up until a couple of hundred years ago, and it was quite easy for a bunch of priests to say, "hey, you used to belong to this land and your ancestors used to live here and here's what your history is," and it could be all brand new to them you see, because all they did was release a bunch of slaves out of Babylon and those slaves themselves became a--

Jackie: Were those a mix of people also?

Alan: There's no doubt about it. How could you lose your language when you've been in captivity for less than 100 years?

Jackie: What do you mean by that?

Alan: Supposedly they went in speaking Hebraic and came out speaking Aramaic.

Jackie: So what is the Hebrew language?

Alan: The Hebrew language really is a much later compilation. In fact, it wasn't until Maimonides in about the 12th century or so, who was the high-rabbi as they called him of his day, it wasn't until he put the language together what they called properly. In other words, he filled in all the vowel points, which were not there. Without the vowels what they used to do was write the consonants and just a little pencil point where a vowel would be because there were so many dialects that different people would put down different vowels in the word. What Maimonides did was to officially put down into law basically what the vowels were so they'd all say the same words and pronounce them the same, but without those particular vowels it was just generally Aramaic. It wasn't different from anything else.

Jackie: Wasn't it Maimonides that said or at least he was quoted as saying that even the best of Christians are worthy of death?

Alan: He didn't write so much on Christians. He wrote more so on Moslems because most of them lived in the Moslem countries in those days and they had to

move from one to another due to warfare. What he did do was to give "*Guidelines to the Perplexed*." That was the title of it. That's where he laid down the rules of how to survive in other people's countries.

Jackie: Is that the 600 and some Halakah or their laws?

Alan: He wrote an awful lot of laws down, but he himself was not a - see, there's different kinds of Judaism and that what people fail to realize. He himself did not believe in the supernatural stories of the Old Testament and other rabbis were against him because of that. He was a very much a rationalist in his way of approaching things. After he died there were actually fights in different Middle Eastern countries, fights to the death between rival groups of Jews - one supporting Maimonides and one supporting the traditional mystical type of rabbinical studies. Maimonides caused a lot of problems after he died because of the laws and so on he'd written.

Jackie: So these people who became "Jews" because of this religion that this priesthood made up for them, they were of a mixed race also. What about the "12 Tribes"? Was it 10 or 12 tribes?

Alan: There was never any 12 Tribes of Israel.

Jackie: Were there ever 10?

Alan: No.

Jackie: What were there?

Alan: There was none. It's a made-up history which never existed.

Jackie: So the Benjamites and the--

Alan: It's all nonsense.

Jackie: All of it?

Alan: It's all in that third book. It's all zodiacal constellations. It's not to do with real people.

Jackie: Okay. What I was thinking that they used those names in the book where it has all the different names of each of the leaders of each of those tribes, Daniel and all of them, so those were made up names too? They did not exist as people?

Alan: Not as people, no. In fact, most of them were titles to the sun. They were titles of the sun or titles of the godhead and Daniel is: "God judges." It's just like when the Christians give titles to Jehovah: Jehovahjireh and Jehovah-this and Jehovah-that. These are all titles.

Jackie: There are those who say it is not Jehovah. It is Yahweh.

Alan: Well, the mouth of madness is very big and you'll find that there are many

people whirling around in the whirlpool inside and that's what religion is for. It's like Christianity, it's so ridiculous the way it's gone. You've got one group almost falling out with another group because one stands on one leg and waves their arms in the air and one stands on the other. It's ridiculous and that's the mouth of madness.

Jackie: All right. Let's go back to the Khazars. We were talking one time. This was quite some time ago and you said I think they were there all the time. Those today that evidentially from the land of the Khazars, Khazaria, and they were a Turkic-Mongolian mix?

Alan: That's a bit wrong there.

Jackie: Okay. What is it?

Alan: It was an empire. It was an empire like the British Empire and just like the British Empire you would have English in the middle and then you'd have other tribes that were taken over from other cultures and colors even around them, all part of that empire and then all eventually called Khazarian. In fact in the Khazarian outer tribes, they were all used for different functions, but some of the outer tribes were even Moslem. The inner group were called the Royal Khazars and they were a nobility just like the nobility of Europe who only intermarried amongst themselves and the Royal Khazars were red-headed or blonde, blue-eyed or green-eyed and as I say they only intermarried amongst themselves, although they ran an empire of many different types of people who all eventually were called Jews when they adopted Judaism. They converted the whole country. A country about the size of Spain converted overnight to Judaism. Now when they disappeared--

Jackie: Oh, excuse me. One of the things that you had said, these people that converted to Judaism, the tribe in Khazaria. You said I think they were there all the time and you said something about that they had migrated, that you believed or had read or whatever that they had migrated into that area.

Alan: I have no doubt they did because they had symbols very similar to Egypt. The only religious symbols that they had were the obelisks. That was the only ones - by people, in fact by rabbis that went into Khazaria during that conversion period. The only symbol of religion that you noticed was the phallic symbol everywhere.

Jackie: The obelisk?

Alan: Yes, the obelisk. One of them said that they were basically a pantheistic people, meaning they worshiped nature, the earth, the "sciences" you might say and they didn't have really a very mystical view of anything.

Jackie: Do you think that these people if they did migrate into that area, do you think they were led there by leaders that knew that this was going to happen eventually in the future. In other words, they're there waiting?

Alan: Yes, I'd say so because the Khazars themselves, it's an interesting lifestyle

that they had. It resembled so closely the nobility of the Normans and all of the European aristocracy descended from the Normans who appeared in Europe at the same time as the nobility of the Khazars disappeared from Khazaria. The same traditions were held by the Normans where they would migrate throughout the year to different palaces of different cities, just like the Queen goes from Buckingham Palace up to this one or that one or whatever throughout the year. That was their tradition. However, they also controlled the trade routes, in fact, to get to China and so on, you'd have to go straight through their land and they lived on taxation. They taxed everyone who moved throughout their land, so that was one of the main incomes.

Jackie: Weren't they even taxing people who had to use the rivers?

Alan: Yes and so they were heavily into taxation and the taxation system. They had a mounted nobility cavalry, advanced in its day, that had their own coats of arms and went into battle in certain formations so they were pretty well invincible in their day. Interestingly enough, as they disappeared from the land of Khazaria, a group of people appear in Normandy in France and call themselves Normans (or at least the historians called them Normans) and they had the same techniques with calvary, coats of arms and everything else and it's thought that this was the nobility of the Khazars who came into Europe and took over the whole of Europe through force of arms. They had unlimited financing to hire mercenary groups and the wars of the Normans on even Britain took many, many years of full scale war, which tells you there was tremendous funding to keep armies in the fields for such a long time. Plus, they built wooden forts on the coastline of France, some of them a few acres in size, and they were prefabricated and they towed them up by parts over the channel to England and re-erected them. You were talking about something on the scale of the Second World War here. Unlimited financing to take over the whole of Europe and definitely with a strategy and a plan and I have no doubt at all that the Catholic Church was part of it, because along with the Normans came the Catholic Church and one basically stood up for the other.

Jackie: Then once they installed the kings and the queens they just continued to interbreed with one another?

Alan: Yes, right up to the present day.

Jackie: Some of our listeners who may be newer that did not hear you say this, but it's something that we have to keep in mind, is that these kings and queens were not even of the same nationality if you would of the people that they were ruling over.

Alan: Exactly.

Jackie: When you said that I thought of Catherine the Great of Russia. She was a German princess and she ruled over the Russians.

Alan: Yes and you probably saw the movie "*Braveheart*," did you?

Jackie: Yes. Alan, in about 50 seconds we're going to be taking our break so remember what you're going to say about "*Braveheart*" and let's pick it up on the

other side. All right, ladies and gentlemen, we're going to be back. We'll be right back with Alan Watt so stay with us. We're talking about the contents of the book here and it certainly is worth having. If you've got I and II this wraps a lot of it up, although I think Alan already has another in mind. If you don't have I and II he suggests that you get them first so you'll have more of a background on ancient history and this won't seem so foreign to you. Before we talk about Mel Gibson, what was the movie?

Alan: "*Braveheart*."

Jackie: *Braveheart*." When I called you today to see if you would come on with us, of course we got into conversation and I wanted to remember the statement that you had made about people who want the truth. Will you repeat that as you mentioned it?

Alan: People generally don't want the truth. If they wanted the truth they'd have to be willing to forego everything they'd ever known, believed, been taught, instilled with, or whatever, and it's like freefalling out of a plane. You've got to jump out of the plane and hope for the best and be willing to allow what's going to happen to happen. Most people really are looking for something which will either augment that which they've already chosen to believe or they're looking for some form of comfort.

Jackie: Right and that's what you said.

Alan: That's the problem.

Jackie: The truth is not comfortable and it's because it is always such a shock. When we've believed something right from the very time we were born and it was pounded and pounded and pounded into our heads and even the history that we were given. The only thing that I see that may have been true at least partially in more recent history are dates and names.

Alan: That's it. You know that's how history is taught in school, is battles, places and names but you never get the why or who financed it. Who benefited from it? That's all omitted.

Jackie: It's all memorization stuff. You have to be able to remember the presidents starting from the beginning to whatever your present is at that stage. I think every school child has to do that as though it means something.

Alan: It's indoctrination.

Jackie: Well of course it is and not only that but it's irrelevant because we know nothing about the presidents and what we do know about them or have been told about them are lies.

Alan: They walked on water. They were superhuman and they walked on water and they never used the bathroom, just like the actors on TV.

Jackie: You know when you hear people calling the church today apostate it's as

though all of that means it's different and it's not the "true church." Whatever it was, ever was, a true church, it was all a fabrication of the priesthood.

Alan: It was very cleverly contrived many thousands of years ago and they created a trinity. They always have trinities in the Mystery Religion and they created Judaism, Christianity and the Moslem all from the same source; and of course they used them all to fight each other, which enriched those behind it. They could also bring them all together at the end, one way or another; Christianity has joined voluntarily but the Moslems have been brought in by force.

Jackie: The third way.

Alan: Getting back to *Braveheart*, in the movie they portray Robert the Bruce as having the legal titlehood for taking over Scotland but he would never do it when Wallace was alive. Then it shows you at the very end of the movie the final battle with Bruce leading the people at the Battle of Bannockburn where they routed the English, but that was to unite the country under the guise of freeing the people.

Jackie: To unite. What do you mean, Scotland?

Alan: Scotland, and so what they did, again, this is the dialectic in action. The English are invading. Scotland has many, many clans all living free and independently and along comes this guy who will be king and after the battle he becomes king, he unifies the country, nationalizes it and introduces taxation for the first time in history. What he did is centralize power and it's so cleverly done and Robert the Bruce was actually Robert de Bruce. He was a Norman knight. He wasn't Scottish at all, so this nobility one way or another became the crowned heads of all of Europe.

Jackie: William Wallace, was he a for-real character?

Alan: Yes, he was.

Jackie: I got real intrigued about William Wallace after I saw that and I wanted to know more about him and Chuck and I were down in Philly and we were at Borders books or one of the big ones and this particular bookstore is like three levels and all kinds of books and I found two books on William Wallace and one basically was when they made up their like poetry to tell a story.

Alan: Sometimes they'll say a note. A note is someone who's died.

Jackie: A node. That's basically what it was. They said there was so very little in history able to tell about William Wallace. Now do you think that's true or they don't want people to know the truth or what?

Alan: In Scotland, because Scotland was a colony of England you've got to remember, Scotland after winning its independence right up until James and James was a descendent of de Bruce, the Stewards were actually another name for the same bunch of de Bruce.

Jackie: The Stewarts?

Alan: They intermarried and intermarried, called themselves the Stewards of Scotland, meaning the keepers, so they changed from de Bruce to Steward which became Stewart as time went on, but James was a direct descendent from them with Norman nobility blood in him too, which doesn't surprise me. Stewart

Jackie: Over all these millennia this group has lasted but they aren't always of the same – the leadership maintains their royal bloodlines but they were in the beginning part of that mixture of people?

Alan: Within the group there's two. There's the ones who only interbred very closely and they're the ones with the high noble stations in life et cetera.

Jackie: Do you think there's a strain? What I'm trying to get clear here, they refer to the Habiru as a mixture so they weren't a pure bloodline of anything?

Alan: No, they weren't.

Jackie: These people – we'll talk about the royal Khazars, the Normans, was that a pure strain?

Alan: As far as we can tell they go back for probably for about 1500 years or so that we can trace at keeping their own marriage lineages and interbreeding at the top.

Jackie: What would be their race or nationality or whatever?

Alan: It's one that they haven't given a name to, to the public. You see this entire world that we live in is a pyramid structure and it's a pyramid structure which is called civilization, which is only possible with the introduction of their money, and the whole world revolves around their money. All school children are trained to get a job to work for their money. It's all to do with the monied system which this small elite have controlled since the beginning of what we're given as time.

Jackie: Are you saying then, that if they did a DNA on let's say Queen Elizabeth they're going to find genes different than anybody else has?

Alan: It would be very interesting to get a hold of it but I don't think they'll ever let it happen.

Jackie: I mean wouldn't that be what you're inferring? If they're of a bloodline that has--

Alan: What you'll definitely get are the same types of genes, traces of other genes. For instance, we know that the Bush's are related to them. There are so many families. So many American presidents are related to them.

Jackie: You said the Bush's are just kind of little twigs on the tree though.

Alan: They're lower down. In fact, Kerry apparently was closer, he had more ties to the royalty than Bush did, but they only give you their own ones to vote for it

seems to be.

Jackie: So the people today that are known as Jews because they were born into this religion. I'm not talking about Sammy Davis, Jr. and Marilyn Monroe and those people who "convert" to that religion. But they are not supposed to intermarry. I guess that's just to keep control of the tribe?

Alan: The thing is, though, most of them who are not nobility, remember, have always intermarried. In fact, most books out in the bookstores will tell you that there's an ongoing crisis within Judaism because so many of the men are marrying into gentile families. The same thing doesn't hold quite as – and they always have done you see, so the lesser ones have always bred into other peoples and many have lost their descendancy by doing so and the rabbis have been screaming at them for hundreds of years to stop doing it and they're still shouting at them to stop doing it.

Even Woody Allen was on a little program – he was with his wife and she's gentile and his mother was there. The mother is home and the father was there and the mother came out with the usual thing you know, in front of this girl too, "It's a pity you married a gentile because if we all do that then we'll disappear," and that's the standard cry of the rabbis.

Jackie: So these people that do object to the intermarrying actually believe that they're of a special bloodline?

Alan: They believe that, there's no doubt about it. Many Jewish publications believe that they are. I mean they're very boastful in promoting all the scientists in history or actors or whoever. They're very boastful of their lineages and who's come out of Judaism and they do boast that they are superior to other people. And I always think how ironical that it was inevitable that the clash in Germany would occur because here you have Adolph – not really Adolph, it was Himmler and the ones behind him who were really into this new religion, very, very New Age at the time, Theosophy really, of creating a Superman, a special superior breed; and here the people holding the reigns of the money power in Germany who already believed that they were the superior breed. There had to be a clash. There had to be a clash and maybe that's the true saying that comes from their own Talmud, *"For every action, there's an equal and opposite reaction,"* because you had two people claiming to be Supermen or special or superior living in the same country. Something had to happen and I think it's sad when people actually believe the mythologies written by rabbis which pump them up into truly believing that they are superior. Now generally that would be called racism if anyone else said we're superior to you because we've created so many musicians and so many scientists and so on and we're genetically superior. Now if anyone said that that would be called hate speech.

Jackie: They all go to the – no, I shouldn't say all, but so many of them go to the high colleges. They get preferential treatment.

Alan: There is another thing that the people have to understand and this is very true as well. The Western peoples were brought up to be employees. The education system was introduced all throughout Europe and Britain and America for the average people; it was to train employees to fill jobs. Whereas in Judaism,

like Mohammedans, they're the same, they will – the first generation will slave and scrimp and do without to put their children through the best schools you can find because they are well aware through their history that you don't get anywhere by being an employee. You have to get to the top and they do sacrifice for their children, so do the Chinese. However, it's one thing that was never ever instilled in the Western culture. The Western culture were definitely bred and raised and pushed towards being employees.

Jackie: That makes all the sense in the world. What do you want to be when you grow up? Do you want to be a policeman? Do you want to be a nurse? But it is never what type of business are you going to start?

Alan: No, it's never, so people can decry the Arabs who are coming in, Chinese or Jews, but they do ensure their children go to the best schools and they do sacrifice a lot to make sure that they get through, so you can't fault them for that. The fault lies in the fact that in the education system and the political system that's emerged or was created in the West, the Western peoples were raised and bred to be workers to others.

Jackie: To bee workers.

Alan: That's right, to bee – that's the yellow and black school bus, the worker bee. There's no doubt about it.

Jackie: I wish I had a more clear understanding of this because it's still very muddy in my head.

Alan: You can't go on preconceived ideas. You have to realize that in ancient times there were powers at work – very, very astute powers with tremendous communications between countries, which kept even the ancient world all working in a system. It wasn't a haphazard system and they had knowledge of what they called previous ages. In other words, civilizations long before Sumer, long before 5,000 BC. There are powers at play in this world which have perfected the systems of deception prior to Sumer and I've no doubt they had much more advanced civilizations at one point according to their own histories of the Druids and the historian Tacitus who took some of the legends of the Druids and they survived previous ages by living inside mountains during floods and ice ages. The same story is told in Mt. Parnassus for the Greeks, and you'll find the same thing in the Himalayas north of India and that's where the high Brahmans say that they survived the last age. You're talking about tremendous sciences held in the hands of the few who always will ensure that they survive, just as today there are underground bases all over the world stocked and prepared for the elite should any plague or warfare breakout again.

Jackie: Okay, but then we'll go back about 3,600 years, about the conflagration that Immanuel Velikovsky wrote about and it appears that the majority of the population of this earth was wiped out.

Alan: It's very possible a good proportion were, but I still think there were some people who survived on the surface of the planet and then one day many, many centuries later a few of these high priests came out of the mountains and started the whole ball rolling again. That's what it seems to be. In fact the Armenians lived

around Mt. Ararat and that's where the fable of Noah's Ark came from. It wasn't a boat or an ark. It was a place of safety because Mt. Ararat is riddled with ancient tunnels where an elite came through bad times before.

Jackie: Way up high in the mountain evidentially.

Alan: Yes and deep within it. In fact, it's so closely guarded even today by the armies around there.

Jackie: How long ago was that supposed to have happened?

Alan: The Egyptians, the Druids and the Brahmins all say that there was one which happened round about 4,000 - 5,000 BC, a big one. A big one and there have been minor ones and localized ones in between.

Jackie: You're talking the flood?

Alan: Flood, ice age, something like that. I mean there's no doubt that there have been many ice ages and even the scientists agree with that. They don't generally agree with very much.

Jackie: But they happened immediately?

Alan: Yes and that's the odd thing with ice ages as we're given it, but there's been many and of course what happens between ice ages is the ice melts, so you get to the point where as it's melting the world gets warmer and something happens and it goes back to an ice age again.

Jackie: What seemed to happen is that at least the account of the Velikovsky's at that particular conflagration, something happened to the earth's crust where what once was very, very warm suddenly was covered with ice and it had to have been something that fast to find those huge mastodons frozen solid in the ice but still had grass and plants, those tropical plants in their throat, in their teeth.

Alan: That was Siberia. That area was the Equator at one time.

Jackie: So something happened to the whole rotation and et cetera of planet earth?

Alan: All you need is one good comet going close by to upset the gravitational paths and so on to upset the kilter of it.

Jackie: And it wouldn't be gravitational. It would be electromagnetic attraction.

Alan: It's all tied in to gravity. That would be enough to do it, or the only other possibly and this is a possibility. I don't rule it out that there have been sciences here before, maybe millions of years ago, which were never entirely lost because the mammoths - the scientific team in 1905 went out to examine in Siberia. They found that one of these mastodons or hairy mammoths also had an erection, which meant it was instantly frozen, and it's hard to imagine even with a comet or something to cause that kind of instantaneous freezing. Science can do it on a

small scale that we know of – and we are at the bottom level of science from professorship down.

Jackie: We're out of time. We're out of our hour. Okay, folks, we're going to be back Monday. Hope you have a nice four days off and we'll see you then.

(Transcribed by Linda)